

Table 2.6-1. Comparison of Alternatives L4 and L5

Alternative L4 (Preferred)	Alternative L5
Estimated Cost: \$37.1 million (almost double the reclamation bond)	Estimated Cost: \$68.5 million (more than triple the reclamation bond)
Amount/type of pit backfill: 2.6 Myd ³ from the L85/86 leach pad (non-acid forming material)	Amount/type of pit backfill: 2.3 Myd ³ from the L85/86 leach pad (non-acid forming material) 10.6 Myd ³ from the L87 leach pad (acid forming)
“Sulfide-rich” portion of the pit highwalls covered with backfill: ~85% (100% north side of divide)	“Sulfide-rich” portion of the pit highwalls covered with backfill: ~100%
Post-reclamation highwalls: Several hundred vertical feet of highwall visible from a distance.	Post-reclamation highwalls: Several hundred vertical feet of highwall visible from a distance.
Pit configuration: Still visible to site visitors.	Pit configuration: Low visibility to site visitors.
Amount of disturbance area revegetated: 81%	Amount of disturbance area revegetated: 85%
Minewide estimated infiltration: 289 gpm	Minewide estimated infiltration: 287 gpm
Reduction from existing infiltration rate: 61%	Reduction from existing infiltration rate: 62%
Pit area estimated infiltration: 89 gpm	Pit area estimated infiltration: 84 gpm
Reduction from existing pit infiltration rate: 54%	Reduction from existing pit infiltration rate: 57%
Sulfate load to Swift Gulch: decreases by 36%	Sulfate load to Swift Gulch: increases by 66%
Number Long-term Seepage Capture Systems Required: Four, same as existing.	Number Long-term Seepage Capture Systems Required: Additional system in Swift Gulch.
<i>Estimated Northern Drainage Basin Contaminant Loads</i>	
Sulfate Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 64,000 Swift Creek: 54,000	Sulfate Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 151,000 Swift Creek: 141,000

Alternative L4 (Preferred)	Alternative L5
Iron Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 26 Swift Creek: 900	Iron Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 60 Swift Creek: 1,300
Aluminum Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 17 Swift Creek: 20	Aluminum Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 130 Swift Creek: 110
Zinc Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 6 Swift Creek: 40	Zinc Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 66 Swift Creek: 100
Arsenic Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 1 Swift Creek: 3	Arsenic Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 1 Swift Creek: 4
Copper Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 1 Swift Creek: 0	Copper Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 5 Swift Creek: 3
Cadmium Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 0 Swift Creek: 0	Cadmium Load (lbs/year): King Creek: 1 Swift Creek: 1
<i>Multiple Accounts Analysis (MAA) Scores (scale of 1 to 9)</i>	
Technical Working Group Score: 7.2 (includes all accounts)	Technical Working Group Score: 7.2 (includes all accounts)
Technical Working Group Score: 7.3 (environmental performance only)	Technical Working Group Score: 7.9 (environmental performance only)
Technical Working Group Score: 9.0 (Swift Gulch groundwater protection score)	Technical Working Group Score: 5.0 (Swift Gulch groundwater protection score)
MAA Cost-Benefit Score: 4.2 (environmental performance/reclamation \$)	MAA Cost-Benefit Score: 3.2 (environmental performance/reclamation \$)